R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 016 707 UD 004 452

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, TITLE I, FY 66 ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT.

NEVADA STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION, CARSON CITY

PUB DATE 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.96 22P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *FEDERAL PROGRAMS, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, EVALUATION METHODS, STATE AGENCIES, PROGRAM COORDINATION, STATISTICAL DATA, INNOVATION, INTERAGENCY COOPERATION, ANNUAL REPORTS, PRIVATE SCHOOLS, SPECIAL SERVICES, NEVADA

THIS NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REPORT CONTAINS ONLY THE NARRATIVE PORTION OF THE EVALUATION OF NEVADA'S COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROJECTS. ONE PART DESCRIBES THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SERVICES GIVEN TO THE LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY THE STATE. BECAUSE ONLY 10 DISTRICTS SUBMITTED APPLICATIONS, THE STATE STAFF WAS ABLE TO OFFER CONSIDERABLE HELP IN DEVELOPING PROPOSALS, ORGANIZING SEMINARS AND INSERVICE ORIENTATION SESSIONS, ESTABLISHING FISCAL PROCEDURES, AND PROVIDING EDITORIAL ASSISTANCE. THE STATE STAFF DEVELOPED EVALUATION GUIDELINES WHICH INCLUDED FIVE SIMPLIFIED DESIGNS WITH EXAMPLES. THEY ALSO REVIEWED THE EVALUATION METHODS PROPOSED BY EACH LOCAL DISTRICT. THERE WAS SOME LOCAL CONFUSION ABOUT THE EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS, DEFINITIONS OF DEPRIVATION, THE POPULATION TO BE SERVED BY THE PROJECTS, AND ALLOCATIONS. NEVADA VIEWS THE USE OF TITLE I FUNDS AS A MEANS OF PROVIDING REMEDIATION FOR RURAL DISADVANTAGED AND GEOGRAPHICALLY ISOLATED YOUTH. COORDINATION WITH COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS AND PROGRAMS FUNDED UNDER OTHER TITLES OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT WAS EFFECTIVE ON THE WHOLE. NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS CHOSE NOT TO INSTITUTE TITLE I ACTIVITIES. THE SECOND PART OF THIS REPORT IS AN ANALYSIS OF VARIOUS PROGRAMS, INCLUDING INNOVATIONS, WITH STATISTICAL AND DESCRIPTIVE DATA. (NH)

F60947ESEA
04452
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED016707

STATE OF NEVADA

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

TITLE I

FY 66 ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

UD 004 452

BURNELL LARSON
Superintendent of Public Instruction

JAMES P. KILEY
Coordinator, Title I

RICHARD M. GUNKEL
Coordinator - Federal Programs

This booklet contains the narrative portion of the FY 66 Title I ESEA Annual Evaluation Report for Nevada. Throughout the narrative reference is made to supporting documents and data which were provided as attachments in the original report. Many of the attachments were previous publications, reports, etc. and therefore have not been included in this publication.

STATE TITLE I ESEA ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT FY 66

PART I

1. OPERATION AND SERVICES

The S.E.A. is able to provide direct technical assistance and consultative service to each L.E.A. in the state. This direct contact is possible because of the unique structure of school district organization in Nevada which provides for a maximum of seventeen local education agencies, each of which has boundaries that are coterminous with county boundaries. (i.e., There are seventeen counties in the state and each county comprises one school district.) Since only fourteen of the L.E.A.'s were eligible Title I ESEA applicants, and only ten of the fourteen submitted applications, the state administrative staff for Title I is able to conduct direct consultation with each school district administrative staff planning to submit a proposal. Many projects are developed cooperatively between state and local representatives to provide Title I programs that meet the needs of each individual district in line with the requirements and intent of Title I.

Other consultative and technical assistance services include, but are not limited to: regional and state-wide seminars; in-service orientation for project staffs; establishing fiscal procedures; editing rough drafts and preparing final proposals; and on-site visitations.

All consultants within the Division of Instruction provide assistance to the L.E.A.'s as their areas of specialization relate to the development and operation of Title I activities.

Consultants were obtained, utilizing state administrative funds, to assist in the development of evaluation guidelines and to assist in seminar presentations relative to Title I evaluation.

*Public Law 89-313 The S.E.A. Title I administrative staff works directly with the State Consultant for Exceptional Pupil Education in the development and coordination of all Title I ESEA programs for exceptional children.

Inasmuch as Nevada has only one institution which provides services to handicapped youngsters, the state Title I office was able to work directly with the Consultant for Exceptional Pupil Education, the staff of the State Mental Hospital and the representatives of a local school district (which are contracted with for the services of professional staff) to develop and implement a Title I program which successfully served 81 handicapped youngsters.

2. DISSEMINATION

(a) Methods utilized in disseminating information relative to Title I ESEA programs by the ten participating school districts were reported as follows:

Formal reports to professional staff	10
Formal reports to community organizations	7
School District publications	5
State-wide publications	2
Reports to professional journals	1

*89-313 Dissemination relative to the Title I program under P.L. 89-313 includes reports to professional staff, reports to community, and state-wide publications.

(b) The state Title I office has produced a brochure describing all Title I ESEA activity in Nevada during FY 66. This brochure has been distributed to all Nevada school districts, to members of the State Department of Education, to the U. S. Office of Education and to various groups and individuals seeking information relative to Title I ESEA in Nevada. (See Attachment #1)

The state Title I office has worked cooperatively with private foundations, universities, the U. S. Office of Education, the National Advisory Council, Regional Laboratories, etc. in providing data relative to Title I programs.

It is anticipated that the varied information provided in the annual evaluation reports will be utilized in organizing data in a variety of ways as a means of presenting new or improved educational practices.

3. EVALUATION

(a) The state Title I office developed an evaluation guideline with the assistance of four L.E.A. representatives and two consultants from the University of Nevada. The guideline presented evaluation as an integral part of an educational program and explained the relationship of needs, objectives, activities and evaluation. The guideline also presented five simplified evaluation designs and provided examples of the use of each design with various activities. (See Attachment #2)

A two and one-half hour panel presentation and discussion was conducted at the Nevada Administrative Seminar held the last week in June. Three consultants were obtained for this presentation, and all school districts participating in Title I had representatives in attendance. (See Attachment #3)

The state Title I staff has met individually with each district to review proposed evaluative methods (i.e. data retrieval, evaluative instruments and techniques, comparative data, data analysis, etc.).

A working relationship has been established with two university consultants who are available to the local educational agencies on a contractual basis.

*P.L. 89-313 The state Title I office and the Consultant for Exceptional Pupil Education met with the administrator and coordinator of the Title I program for handicapped children to establish the evaluation procedure and identify the kinds of information to be retrieved.

(b) The names and titles of state personnel providing evaluation assistance are:

Mr. James P. Kiley, Coordinator, Title I ESEA

*89-313 Mr. James P. Kiley, Coordinator, Title I ESEA
Mr. Thomas Murdoch, Consultant for Exceptional Pupil Education

(c) The consultants providing evaluation assistance to the State are:

Dr. Robert Whittemore, Director
Counseling and Testing Services
University of Nevada
Reno, Nevada

Dr. Verdun Trione
Department of Education
Nevada Southern University
Las Vegas, Nevada

*89-313 Same as above.

(d) See #1 - Tabular Data.

4. MAJOR PROBLEM AREAS

(a) (1) Reviewing Proposals

As indicated above, since we have a small number of eligible L.E.A.'s, we are able to participate in planning sessions with L.E.A. administrative staffs and, therefore, have not encountered any major problems in reviewing proposals. We utilize the consultants in the State Department Division of Instruction in reviewing proposals as they relate to the area of specialization of each consultant.

(2) Operation and Service

The State Department has the full-time equivalent of one and one-half professional personnel to support Title I administration directly. All consultants in the Division of Instruction serve the Title I program as their areas of specialization relate to the development and operation of on-going Title I projects in the various districts.

The organization and planning for regional and state-wide seminars and in-service programs; for contracting consultant teams for on-site visitations, video tape and amplified telephone presentations; for publications, research and dissemination, etc. are very much curtailed due to the seemingly endless requests for surveys, statistical reports, fiscal reports, ad infinitum. A disproportionate amount of time must be set aside for the mundane data gathering that has been required.

(3) Evaluation

The local education agencies seemed to have some misunderstandings regarding the evaluation of Title I ESEA activities. Perhaps the greatest misconception was that many viewed evaluation as a separate part of their program rather than as an on-going, concurrent part of the program. Thus, many did not retrieve data until the annual evaluation forms were received.

*89-313 Since the State has only one school operated for handicapped children, few problems were encountered in the administration of the one program under P.L. 89-313.

(4) Other

The geographic and demographic characteristics of Nevada are such that school districts do not serve large urban ghettos nor large numbers of specific minority group members.

We have individual L.E.A.'s serving geographic areas as large as several New England states with small, one room rural schools scattered throughout the district as far as 120 miles apart.

We, in the State Agency, do not view Title I as a Civil Rights Act but as a program which can enable school districts to develop and implement activities and services for economically and educationally disadvantaged youth in rural as well as urban centers.

(b) Some consideration should be given to youngsters who are culturally disadvantaged because of their geographic isolation. While many of these youngsters are not economically disadvantaged, they are educationally disadvantaged because of the limited resources available to them.

5. IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION 205 (a) (1)

(a) Nineteen project applications were submitted by ten of the fourteen eligible local education agencies and one project application was submitted under P.L. 89-313. As indicated previously, due to the small number of eligible applicants, it has been possible for the State Agency to assist each applicant in the development of Title I programs. Most of the negotiations centered around changes on various items on OE 4304 and OE 4305. These were necessitated simply because of misinterpretations of the items and required only mechanical adjustments.

(b) The most prevalent misconception was in regard to the student population to be served by Title I, which resulted from the confusion concerning the relationship between "economic" and "educational" deprivation. The assumption that there is a high correlation between economic, educational and cultural deprivation has been difficult to communicate. The initial tendency was to dilute the effectiveness of programs by attempting to serve all students.

Next in order was the institutional needs versus student needs dilemma. The first impulse was to provide equipment, materials and additional space rather than to focus on programs designed to service identified student needs through additional professional, para- and sub-professional personnel.

6. COORDINATION OF TITLE I AND COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

(a) During FY 66, approved Community Action Programs existed in only two of the seventeen school districts. The two districts involved, Clark County School District and Washoe County School District, are the two largest in the state and they submitted eight project applications for Title I programs. (Clark County - 6 project applications, Washoe County - 2 project applications)

(b) The total amount of Title I funds approved for L.E.A.'s where an approved C.A.P. exists is $610,264.00. (Clark County - $412,972.00, Washoe County - $197,292.00)

(c) The State Department Title I office has met with Mr. Bruce Parks, State Technical Assistance Officer, and Mr. Russell McConnell, Director of Community Action Programs for Nevada's rural counties. The Title I program, its regulations and purpose, have been thoroughly discussed. Both of the L.E.A.'s which have approved C.A.P.'s have developed good working relationships and the remaining L.E.A.'s have worked with the State Technical Assistance Officer directly.

(d) The posture of both the C.A.A.'s and the State Technical Assistance Officer has been one of "blanket endorsement". Evidence of cooperative development appeared this past summer as the C.A.A. and Washoe County School District worked together to develop complimentary programs.

The ten participating L.E.A.'s reported the following methods taken to insure coordination and cooperation with Community Action Agencies:

Communication with State Technical Assistance Officer	5
Communication with Local Community Action Agency	2
Joint Meetings with school officials and C.A.A. officials	2
Cooperative Planning with C.A.A. and school officials	2

(e) There have been no incidents or conflicts between C.A.A.'s and L.E.A.'s and nothing is presently taking place which would precipitate a problem.

It has been only recently that any effort has been made to extend Community Action Services on an organized basis out in the rural (15 of 17 total) counties in Nevada.

None of the ten L.E.A.'s indicated any problems in securing C.A.A. cooperation.

(f) As indicated above, eight of the ten L.E.A. applicants did not have organized C.A.A.'s operating within the districts. The only Office of Economic Opportunity program conducted in a few of the eight L.E.A.'s was the Head Start program, and this was an "umbrella" program through the University of Nevada.

Representatives of both of the larger L.E.A.'s participate on the local Community Action Board, and thus duplication of effort is being avoided.

*89-313 Due to the lateness of the appropriation and development of the Title I program for handicapped children, the planning and coordination was only effected through the Nevada Welfare Department, the Nevada Attorney General's office, the Nevada Department of Administration Budget Office, representatives of the Nevada State Hospital, representatives of the Washoe County School District and the State Department of Education.

(g) Perhaps the initial misconceptions regarding C.A.A. and L.E.A. cooperation and coordination have been clarified. However, it would seem that the reciprocity of this arrangement has tended to be somewhat biased and that the strength of this agreement lies in mutual coordination and not approval or disapproval.

*89-313 Described above (f)

7. INTER-RELATIONSHIP OF TITLE I WITH OTHER TITLES OF ESEA

(a) Eight of the ten participating districts reported the utilization of instructional materials acquired under Title II ESEA in the implementation of the Title I programs. Greatest utilization was in the areas of Remedial Reading and Language Arts. The identification of the needs of culturally and educationally deprived youngsters precipitated by Title I ESEA resulted in the acquisition of materials for this segment of the student population.

(b) Nevada had only two programs under Title III ESEA during FY 66. The local school superintendents agreed to utilize the bulk of Title III funds for the implementation of a planning grant for a state-wide educational television network. While this program barely got underway last year, it certainly has many implications relating to Title I, and we would anticipate many benefits to districts planning Title I programs, particularly those districts serving the small, geographically isolated schools.

The second Title III program in Nevada is a Social Studies Laboratory project in one of the smaller districts. As this program becomes operational, we anticipate that the dissemination of information concerning this new, individualized approach to the teaching of social studies will be of value to those designing programs for disadvantaged youth.

(c) As the Regional Laboratories (Far West and Southwest) complete their organizational patterns and develop lines of communication, the State Agency will continue its efforts to insure the involvement of local educational agencies as active participants in research and dissemination.

(d) The Coordinator of Federal Programs, who devotes approximately one-half of his time to Title I ESEA administration, represents one of the program functions currently funded under Title V ESEA.

Another resource provided under Title V includes a Media and Publication Consultant and a reinforced Graphic Arts Department. The services of this specialist will be utilized by the state Title I office for professional and technical assistance in the dissemination of information relative to Title I programs and for the professional consultative services to the L.E.A.'s in the development and implementation of Title I programs.

Other professional and technical functions proposed under Title V ESEA will serve to augment and expand the total professional resources available to L.E.A.'s for the development of sound educational programs for children.

(e) The posture of the State Agency has been to communicate, via seminars, inservice programs, memoranda, etc. the concept of horizontal utilization of funding sources in educational programming. We have not limited this approach to the various ESEA sources, but have advocated the coordination of N.D.E.A., Vocational Education, etc., as well. Greatest success in this endeavor during FY 66 (due to the lateness in Title I ESEA in part) was effected with Title II ESEA. Many districts (as indicated in part "a" above) acquired library and instructional materials for use in Title I programs.

(f) Time was the greatest problem area involved in developing and implementing projects relating Title I with other Titles of ESEA during FY 66. School districts were simply overwhelmed with all of the new resources and the accompanying regulations and guidelines. Limited administrative staff and insufficient time to involve the instructional staff for planning and development made it difficult for L.E.A.'s to gain the maximum utilization of all resources.

(g) The uncertainty of Congressional appropriations has produced a "cliff-hanging" effect in that L.E.A.'s are unable to plan programs far enough in advance because they don't know what funds will be available to them.

Many proposed amendments have also created problems in that appropriations, guidelines and regulations change while districts attempt to develop programs.

8. COOPERATIVE PROJECTS BETWEEN DISTRICTS

(a) (b) (c) - Not applicable. There were no cooperative projects in Nevada during FY 66.

9. NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION

(a) The state Title I office has encouraged the L.E.A.'s to conduct joint planning and development meetings with representatives from the non-public schools in their respective districts. The state Title I office has also, through guideline and regulations interpretations to the local districts, made the local districts aware of the implications of Attorney General Opinions 276 and 278. (See Attachment #4)

*P. L. 89-313 - The only state supported program for handicapped youngsters is the Nevada State Hospital in Sparks, Nevada. Youngsters attending this program reside in the institution, and most are handicapped to the extent that they have never been in public or non-public schools. This institution serves the entire State of Nevada.

(b) Of the ten L.E.A. Title I ESEA applicants, only five have non-public schools operating within their districts. The districts reported the following methods of involving non-public school officials:

Letter contact only	- 3
Joint meetings with public and non-public school officials to discuss participation in existing projects	- 3
Joint meetings with public and non-public school officials for the development and implementation of cooperative projects	- 1

(c) Only two of the L.E.A.'s indicated any problems encountered in developing cooperative projects with non-public schools. One district reported that after discussing the program with the non-public school personnel the non-public school administrator declined the cooperative endeavor on the grounds that it violated their belief in separation of church and state. The other district reported that the non-public school representatives evinced little interest in the program.

(d) Since there are undoubtedly many variations among the statutes of all states, it seems that it would be most appropriate to conduct an exhaustive review of all such statutes in order to determine any legislative revisions regarding sectarian participation in Title I ESEA.

(e) See Tabular Data #2

1C. SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

(a) As indicated previously, due to the structure of L.E.A.'s in the State of Nevada, we have not found it necessary to publish guidelines or criteria for Title I ESEA to expedite the implementation of programs. Direct, on-site consultative service negates possible misunderstandings resulting from written guidelines and regulations.

(b) No outside agencies have been contracted with for evaluations of Title I programs.

(c) See Part III, Table VI

(d) See Attachment #5

PART II

COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS

1. STATISTICAL INFORMATION

Classification	Number of LEA's for which Title I programs have been approved	Funds Actually Committed	Unduplicated Count of Children				Average cost per pupil Col. 3 by Col. 4
			Total Col. 5, 6 & 7	Public	Non Public	Not Enrolled	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
A	2	511,860.66	5864	5824	35	5	87.29
D	8	189,706.20	1444	1438	6	0	131.38
TOTAL	10	701,566.86	7308	7262	41	5	95.99

2. ESTABLISHING PROJECT AREAS

The ten participating districts have indicated the following methods for establishing project areas:

Census Information	8
School Surveys	8
AFDC Payments	6
Free Lunch Data	6
Health Records	1
County Juvenile Department	1
Bureau of Indian Affairs	1
Office of Economic Opportunity	1
County Welfare	1
State Welfare	1

3. NEEDS

SMSA Classification "A"
Needs as reported by the L.E.A.'s:

Deficiencies in Verbal Functioning
Deficiencies in Self Concept
Deficiencies in Reading
Deficiencies in Computation Skills
Deficiencies in Social and Emotional Behavior
Deficiencies in Experiences
Deficiencies in Achievement Levels
Deficiencies in Family Environment
Deficiencies in Motivation
Deficiencies in Educational and Vocational Aspirations
Deficiencies in Basic Skills
Deficiencies in Study Habits
Deficiencies in Abstraction Ability
Deficiencies in Hygienic Standards

SMSA Classification "D"
Needs as reported by the L.E.A.'s:

Deficiencies in Reading
Deficiencies in Achievement in Subject Areas
Deficiencies in Self Concept
Deficiencies in Home Environment
Deficiencies in Language Arts
Deficiencies in Computation Skills
Deficiencies in Nutrition
Deficiencies in Cultural Background
Deficiencies in Intellectual Ability
Deficiencies in Educational and Vocational Aspirations
Deficiencies in Motivation
Deficiencies in Health (Dental, Medical)
Deficiencies in Clothing

4. LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY PROBLEMS

SMSA Classification "A"
Rank order of problems as reported by districts:

Lack of Adequate Facilities
Lack of Instructional Personnel
Lack of Interest of Community
Lack of Sufficient Time for Project Planning and Development

SMSA Classification "D"
Rank order of problems as reported by districts:

Lack of Administrative Personnel
Lack of Instructional Personnel
Lack of Sufficient Time for Project Planning and Development
Lack of Sufficient Funds for the Development of Adequate Programs
Lack of Favorable Attitudes toward Target Population
Lack of Adequate Facilities

5. PREVALENT ACTIVITIES

SMSA Classification "A":

Remedial Reading and Language Development Programs

Provisions for remedial reading specialists, counseling services, health specialists, teacher aides, consultants, etc. — 4 Activities

Remediation Programs in Language Arts, Mathematics, Social Studies, and Science

Provisions for teacher specialists, counselors, and small group instruction. — 3 Activities

Student Work Program

Provision for work experiences for youngsters, to enable them to gain feelings of personal worth as contributing members of society and to give them an opportunity to purchase clothing, books, etc. — 1 Activity

Migrant Student Program

Provision of professional staff to provide individualized instruction for migrant children and to facilitate transfer of pupil records. — 1 Activity

Enrichment Program through Summer School Scholarship Program

Small class instruction in science, social studies, language arts, and mathematics. Provision for field trips, laboratory periods, counseling services, etc. — 1 Activity

SMSA Classification "D":

Remedial Reading Program

Provision for reading specialists, small classes, in-service program, special instructional materials, etc. — 9 Activities

Remediation Programs in Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies

Provisions for small group instruction, counseling services, special instructional aids, etc. — 5 Activities

After School Study Centers

Provision for extended day library services, small group (tutorial) assistance, counseling services, etc. — 2 Activities

Reduction of Class Size

Provision for teacher aides and additional professional staff to provide for more individualized instruction. — 2 Activities

Library Resource Materials Programs

Providing various visual and media materials for youngsters attending small, isolated, rural schools. Variety of materials to augment instructional program through vicarious experiences. Also provision for field trips. — 2 Activities

Student Work Program

To provide work experiences to youngsters to give them a feeling of worth and dignity through constructive, productive activity and to enable them to purchase needed clothing, food, books, etc. — 1 Activity

Special Education Program

The establishment of an education program for handicapped youth by providing professional staff, aides, instructional materials, equipment, etc. — 1 Activity

Psychological Services

Providing psychological services to youngsters on the basis of teacher, counselor and administrative referrals. — 1 Activity

Counseling Services

Providing increased counseling services to disadvantaged youth through addition to professional staff. — 1 Activity

6. INNOVATIVE PROJECTS

SMSA Classification "A"

Junior High School Preparation
Project 21-C-4

During the summer months, 265 sixth grade students received instruction and services from a professional staff of 12 teachers, 2 special education teachers, 3 remedial reading teachers and 7 counselors as a means of preparing the students for junior high school. Actually the primary objective of the activity was to effect attitude changes among the target area youth. Instruction and counseling services were provided on an individual and small group basis, and the program was augmented through field trips and discussions conducted by many civic and industrial leaders. The professional staff felt that the students are much better prepared, both in attitude and academic preparation, to begin the 66-67 school year.

Summer School Remedial Reading Clinic
Project 11-W-2

During a six week summer program, 64 youngsters in grades four through nine participated in a remedial reading clinic and received the services of 18 classroom teachers, 2 special education teachers, 8 remedial reading teachers, 2 counselors, 1 school nurse, 8 optometrists and 2 physicians. A complete diagnosis was attempted for each youngster, and individual remediation was provided on the basis of the diagnoses. All professional staff received inservice training during the afternoon sessions, and consultants were obtained for this part of the program. All professional staff returned to target area schools during the 66-67 school year.

SMSA Classification "D"

Summer School Remedial Reading Clinic
Project 18-OR-1

During a four week summer remedial reading program 69 public and 6 non-public school youngsters received tutorial remediation from 17 classroom teachers, 2 remedial reading teachers, and 1 psychologist. The uniqueness of this program was the laboratory type inservice program and follow-up consultative service provided to the teachers. Various diagnostic techniques, particularly perceptual, were demonstrated to the teachers by consultants working with different students. Treatments for diagnosed problems were also demonstrated, and follow-up consultative services were provided as teachers gained experiences through practice.

7. METHODS OF INCREASING STAFF FOR TITLE I PROJECTS

SMSA Classification "A"

Number of Staff Members District Planned to Add to Implement Title I ESEA Programs:

Type of Staff Member (Specific Position Title)	Number Proposed To Be Added	Number Actually Added
Coordinator, Title I Projects	2	2
Remedial Reading Teachers	98	65
Counselors	15	4
Librarians	7	3
Media Specialist	1	1
Remedial Reading Consultants	2	2
Teacher Aides	28	54

126	Number of present staff utilized in after school projects
0	Number of present staff utilized in weekend projects
96	Number of present staff utilized in summer projects

The two districts under SMSA classification "A" conducted three formal inservice programs for staff participating in the Title I ESEA ... programs. Master teachers, specialists and outside consultative services were utilized to further develop staff competencies.

SMSA Classification "D"

Number of Staff Members District Planned to Add to Implement Title I ESEA Programs:

Type of Staff Member (Specific Position Title)	Number Proposed To Be Added	Number Actually Added
Family Service Specialist	1	0
Special Education Teacher	2	2
Counselor	1	1
Remedial Reading Teacher	1	1
Reduced Load Teacher	1	1
Ungraded Remedial Teacher	2	2
Teacher Aides Full-Time	4	3
Teacher Aides Part-Time	8	7

27 Number of present staff utilized in after school projects
0 Number of present staff utilized in weekend projects
49 Number of present staff utilized in summer projects

Seven of the eight districts under the SMSA Classification "D" conducted formal inservice programs for staff participating in the Title I ESEA programs. These smaller districts utilized consultants through contracted services to augment their present staffs as it was not often feasible to recruit additional professional personnel.

8. MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

(a) Pre-kindergarten/kindergarten
Not Applicable

(b) Grades 1-3
California Achievement Tests
Stanford Achievement Tests Forms N, W, X, Y
California Reading Achievement Tests Forms W, X
Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulties
Spache Test

(c) Grades 4-6
Iowa Silent Reading Tests Form BM
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills
Stanford Achievement Tests Forms A, N, X, Y
Diagnostic Reading Survey
Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulties
Spache Test

(d) Grades 7-9
Stanford Achievement Tests Forms W, X, Y
California Achievement Tests Forms X, Y
Metropolitan Achievement Tests Form AM
Gates Reading Survey Form I
Diagnostic Reading Survey
Bell School Inventory
Differential Aptitude Test
Spache Test
California Reading Test Form W
Diagnostic Spelling Test
McCalls - Crab Test Books (Vocabulary) Forms D, E
Index of Adjustment & Values - Self Concept

(e) Grades 10-12

SRA Diagnostic Reading Test Survey Forms 111A, 111B, IV A
Iowa Tests of Educational Development M.A.T. Form AM
Metropolitan Achievement Test Form AM

9. ANALYSIS OF EFFECTIVE ACTIVITIES AND METHODS

(a) Due to the comparatively small number of applicant L.E.A.'s, and the correspondingly small number of Title I ESEA projects, all projects implemented by the two L.E.A.'s under the SMSA classification "A" are listed below.

Remedial Reading and Language Development Project (Grades K-6 and Special Education)

Activities included the employment of remedial reading teachers and teacher aides to provide small group remedial reading instruction; employment of additional counselors for intensified counseling services and home contact; employment of additional librarians to provide assistance to project staff and students; and a media saturation activity to augment the remediation instruction for a selected segment of the target area students.

Migrant Student Project (Grades 1-6)

Activity included employment of an additional staff member for the individual evaluation and placement of migrant children as a means of individualizing the curriculum for each child.

Remedial Reading Clinic Project (Grades 4-9)

Activities include thorough diagnosis for each youngster by utilizing the services of a reading specialist, an audiologist, a psychologist, an optometrist, a nurse and a medical doctor; and intensive remedial reading instruction as prescribed by diagnoses.

After School Learning Center Project (Grades 4-12)

Activities include counseling services; library services; and remediation and general scholastic development provided by subject matter specialists.

Summer Junior High School Preparation Project (Grades 7-9)

Activities included individual and small group counseling; individual remedial instruction provided by subject matter specialists; field trips to entertainment, industrial and civic centers; and presentations and discussions conducted by civic and business leaders.

Junior High Reading Laboratory Project (Grades 7-9)

The activity included the establishment of eight reading laboratories (including equipment, instructional supplies and a full time reading specialist and teacher's aide for each center) to provide remedial reading service to junior high school students.

Reinforced Studies Project (Grades 7-9)

This project was designed to assist educationally disadvantaged students who were experiencing difficulties in a junior high school with modular scheduling. The project students were failing to adjust to the modular program. Activities included counseling services and reinforced instruction in basic subject matter areas.

Summer Scholarship Project (Grades 7-9)

Tuition was provided to enable students to participate in summer remediation and enrichment classes.

Student Work Program Project (Grades 7-12)

The activity involved providing work experiences to junior and senior high school students. Students were placed on various jobs within the schools such as custodian, food service, instructional aides, library aides, etc.

SMSA Classification "D"

Due to the comparatively small number of applicant L.E.A.'s, all project activities implemented under FY 66 Title I ESEA are listed below by grade level.

Remedial Reading (Grades 1-12)

Activities included the procurement of additional professional staff and teacher aides to provide small group remedial instruction and the acquisition of materials and equipment.

Psychological Services (Grades 1-12)

Activity included the contracting of psychologists to provide individual diagnoses for students referred by school personnel. Information obtained from the psychologists was utilized to provide individualized instruction for the students.

Enrichment Program (Grades 1-12)

Instructional materials, equipment, films, filmstrips, etc. were obtained to provide vicarious experiences for youngsters attending small, isolated schools.

Arts and Crafts Program (Grades 4-12)

After-school arts and crafts center included painting, pottery, leathercraft, metal and woodworking for the educationally and economically disadvantaged youngsters.

Student Work Program (Grades 4-12)

Activity involved providing work experiences for youngsters in an effort to develop self-concept and effect changes in attitude.

After School Learning Centers (Grades 4-12)

Activities included individual and small group remediation in basic subject matter areas; library services; and counseling services.

Vocational Guidance (Grades 7-12)

Guidance personnel focused on the economically and educationally disadvantaged students by establishing a vocational guidance center and developing special vocational guidance units for small groups of students.

Ungraded Remedial Program (Grades 7-12)

Additional professional personnel and aides were used to provide ungraded remediation in basic subject matter areas for students experiencing difficulty in the traditional lock-step program.

Impacted Visual Aids (Grades 7-12)

Modern visual innovations were utilized in presenting and reinforcing conceptual skills in English composition; and individual laboratory approach was developed for life science instruction; and charts, models, filmstrips, transparencies, etc. were used in developing a program of instruction in basic arithmetic skills.

(b) Late receipt of equipment and materials handicapped many activities. Some L.E.A.'s attempted to compensate for this by extending programs into the summer months. However, in some instances the extension created new problems in staffing, contacting students, etc.

Several activities were diluted due to the failure to orient staff, student population, and parents as to the intent of the programs.

Evaluative information was insufficient in several instances because of failure to follow through with evaluative strategy and the tendency to view evaluation as separate from the total program. Some districts waited until well after project termination to attempt to retrieve and organize evaluative data.

Perhaps the greatest weakness encountered in the development and implementation of Title I activities was the failure to involve the teaching staff at the onset of planning. Many faculty members who participated in programs were not fully aware of the intent of Title I. Also, insufficient coordination efforts, particularly in the larger districts, resulted in problems in the implementation and evaluation of activities.

For the most part, summer programs (not extensions of school year programs) seemed quite successful. School administrators were more familiar with Title I guidelines, regulations, etc. and had gained experience through the development and implementation of school year programs. Districts had more time to plan, teaching staff were involved and informed, and coordination was effected. A greater understanding of the intent of Title I resulted in greater impact on target area youth.

Projects which provided inservice training for staff before and/or during the implementation of activities and those which provided ancillary services in conjunction with instructional services seemed most effective.

10. GENERAL ANALYSIS OF TITLE I

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 has forced the public schools, colleges, universities, and the lay public to become more aware of a certain segment of the student population of the nation's schools. As a result of this awareness, we have seen evidence of many efforts to provide compensatory educational programs and services to a group of youngsters who otherwise would still have been floundering in the regular school program.

In Nevada, this awareness has stimulated change in four major categories: curriculum development; instructional methods; inservice training; and the development of ancillary services. While the magnitude of change has not been great, the evidence of trends toward change has been encouraging.

School districts which just provided "more of the same content and method" in remediation and enrichment programs proved resounding failures very early in their implementation. This experience caused districts to re-examine programs and consider factors such as deficiencies in home environments, health and nutritional deficiencies and experiential and cultural differences in children. Thus many teachers were able to escape the confinement of "textbook teaching" and provided visual and kinesthetic experiences to youngsters through the use of varied instructional materials and aids.

The identification of deficiencies in nutrition, health, self concept, home environment, etc. has resulted in fostering several beneficial outcomes. First, students have received the services of counselors, psychologists, home-school social workers, medical teams and nutritional supplements. The second beneficial outcome is that the coordination-communication between instructional staff and ancillary services personnel have been strengthened through mutual reinforcement.

Perhaps the single most effective criterion which could have been used to predict the success of Title I programs in FY 66 was whether or not inservice training was included. The reference here is not to the "40 hour devotion" type of inservice, but to the planning, curriculum and method type inservice centered around student characteristics.

We feel that the past year has been fruitful in that the experience gained and the increased awareness of the needs of students will result in the development and implementation of improved educational programs for disadvantaged youth.